1
Ag 84 Mr
copy 2

SUPPLY AND PRICE DATA ON COTTON GIN MOTES

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
DEC 22 1967
CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

Marketing Research Report No. 809

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Economic Research Service

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 20 cents

PREFACE

The data on gin motes for this study were collected by personnel of the Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, from cotton ginners. This low-cost raw material is used in the manufacture of many products. The analysis of the data in this report provides information on supply and price that has not been available before.

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary and conclusions	iv
Introduction	1
Problem and objectives	1
Methodology	2
Collecting and disposal practices	2
Supply of gin motes	5
Southeast	5
South Central	7
Southwest	7
West	7
Prices received	7
Price differentials	9
Cleaning versus not cleaning	9
Prices received by outlets	10
Appendix	11

Washington, D. C. November 1967

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

About 38 percent of U.S. gins collected motes--any gin waste usable for its fiber content--in 1966-67. The proportion of gins that reclaimed motes varied from a low of 27 percent in the South Central region to a high of 75 percent in the West.

Estimates based on data obtained from a sample of 692 gins in 19 States indicate that 81.6 million pounds of motes were collected by all gins in 1966-67. The Southwestern and Western regions accounted for 67 percent of the total. Texas and California accounted for over half of the U.S. supply, with 24.4 million and 23.4 million pounds respectively.

Ginners received an average of 3.25 cents per pound for baled motes and 0.86 cent per pound for loose motes. Regional prices for baled motes ranged from 2.79 cents per pound in the Southeast to 4.22 cents in the West.

The current price differences in the Southeast and South Central regions are so small between baled and loose motes that selling baled motes does not seem justifiable if motes can be sold in loose form. In contrast, price spreads in the Southwest and West favor selling baled motes. If motes must be cleaned to make them marketable, and the premium for cleaning is less than 1 cent, the degree of cleaning weight loss should not exceed 20 percent of original weight.

Current and future emphasis on air pollution will increase the extent and cost of gin waste disposal. Growing restrictions on burning gin waste will cause an increasing number of gin plants to incur waste disposal hauling costs. Thus, there will be an added incentive to sell as much gin waste as possible, even if only the costs of collecting and hauling are covered. Ginners who currently do not collect motes may find it profitable to do so in the near future.

The proportion of bales from which motes were collected, plus average pounds of gin motes removed per bale, developed from the gins that were studied, could be used to estimate mote supplies for the next few years. These data should provide a good estimate, unless there is a significant change in gin mote collecting practices. The sample data can be updated when enough change has occurred to substantially affect the estimates.

SUPPLY AND PRICE DATA ON COTTON GIN MOTES

by

Shelby H. Holder, Jr., Agricultural Economist
Marketing Economics Division
Economic Research Service

INTRODUCTION

Some cotton ginners have reclaimed gin motes for many years. However, only within recent years has it become a widespread practice. 1/ Growth in importance of gin motes has been due mainly to their use as a raw material in manufacturing cotton batting. Because of their relatively low price, good resilience, and longer staple length, gin motes have been substituted for types of cotton mill waste which due to changes in mill operations are no longer available, or no longer competitive in price.

Problem and Objectives

Little is known about the supply of gin motes other than estimates based on number of bales ginned and quantity of waste material removed at each stage of lint cleaning. Such estimates provide good potential supply data, but much more important to the marketing and manufacturing sectors is an estimate of actual supply. When relatively few ginners were collecting motes, there was little market interest in supply and price information. However, as volume and importance of motes have increased, inquiries have become more numerous from ginners, buyers, and manufacturers.

Manufacturers stock raw materials needed for their manufacturing operation according to current orders and anticipation of future orders. If short supplies are expected for some raw materials, additional stocks are added to inventories. When supplies are less than the amount needed, arrangements must be made to acquire adequate substitutes. Failure to make correct decisions on raw material needs and purchases can mean the difference between profit or loss. Hence, a knowledge of location and supply of raw materials is helpful to buyers and manufacturers planning for needs and purchases.

Since a seller seeks the highest possible price for the goods he has to market, a knowledge of its general price level helps him to determine its

---

1/ The term "gin motes" or "motes" refers to any cotton waste from the cotton ginning process that is usable for its fiber content. Most of this material comes from lint cleaners.

market value. Thus, price data on local, State, and national levels would improve the bargaining position of ginners who collect motes.

To alleviate some problems associated with lack of supply and price information for cotton gin motes, objectives of this study were to:

1. Determine the proportion of gins collecting motes, and the handling and disposal practices used.

2. Provide supply information on a district, State, regional, and national basis.

3. Obtain current data on the price of gin motes.

Methodology

A representative cross section of active gin plants in the United States was obtained by a random sample of gins in all States and geographical regions of the Cotton Belt. Data were collected from 692 gins by members of the Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service. Data from the sample gins, representing approximately 14 percent of all gins, and about 17 percent of total bales ginned, were expanded by using U. S. Census reports of 1966-67 ginnings.

COLLECTING AND DISPOSAL PRACTICES

Cotton gin motes were collected at approximately 38 percent of the gins in the United States in 1966-67 (table 1). Proportions varied widely within States and between States and geographical regions. State proportions ranged from a low of 3 percent in Louisiana to a high of 88 percent in California. The West had the highest regional proportion of gins collecting motes--75 percent.

Most gin motes were sold in baled form in the Southeast and in loose form in the West. For the entire Cotton Belt, proportions were 54 percent baled and 46 percent loose. Less than one-fourth of all motes sold in baled form were cleaned at the gin.

Motes were sold most frequently to mote dealers, with mote-cleaning plants the second most common outlet. 2/ Baled motes generally are sold to mote dealers and loose motes to mote-cleaning plants.

Sixty-two percent of all gins discarded their motes (table 2). Although in some States very few discarded motes were burned, 58 percent of all gins studied used this method of disposal. A higher percentage of motes were discarded in the South Central region than in any other region. Except for this region, most of the motes not burned were returned to the land as a

2/ Mote-cleaning plants are establishments that buy loose or baled motes, and clean and bale them for resale.

Table 1.--Proportion of gins collecting motes, collection method, and sales outlet, by State and region, 1966-67

State and region [1]	Gins collecting	Collecting method [2]		Baled motes cleaned	Outlet			
		Baled	Loose		Mote plant	Linters dealer	Mote dealer	Other [3]
	Percent							
Alabama	46	100	--	23	20	13	34	33
Florida	20	100	--	--	100	--	--	--
Georgia	36	90	10	--	13	7	80	--
North Carolina	51	83	17	--	4	4	88	4
South Carolina	51	72	28	--	-	9	64	27
Virginia	9	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
Southeast	43	90	10	7	10	8	65	17
Arkansas	13	57	43	50	--	--	71	29
Louisiana	3	100	-	100	--	--	--	100
Mississippi	33	78	22	17	30	48	18	4
Missouri	11	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
Tennessee	58	72	28	22	23	--	71	6
South Central [4]	27	75	25	18	22	24	44	9
Oklahoma	17	96	4	50	--	--	100	--
Texas	34	52	48	59	47	4	49	--
Southwest	32	52	48	58	44	4	53	--
Arizona	64	30	70	50	42	--	50	8
California	88	13	87	100	52	--	48	--
New Mexico	67	35	65	100	25	--	75	--
West [4]	75	18	82	80	45	--	53	2
United States	38	54	46	23	27	9	56	8

1/ For more detailed data by State districts see appendix table 6.
2/ Proportions based on pounds of motes collected by each method.
3/ Includes, in order of rank, mill waste dealers, batting manufacturers, and bedding and furniture manufacturers.
4/ Totals include minor States not shown.

Table 2.--Proportion of gins discarding motes, method of disposal, and reason for discarding, by State and region, 1966-67

State and region 1/	Gins discarding	Method of disposal			Reason for discarding motes					
		Burned	Left on premises	Other	Lack of equipment	Volume too small	Lack of market	Price too low	Customer relation	Other 2/
	Percent									
Alabama	54	50	16	34	33	3	17	39	3	6
Florida	80	50	--	50	50	--	25	25	--	--
Georgia	64	42	15	43	25	2	21	43	--	9
North Carolina	49	17	4	79	--	41	6	53	--	--
South Carolina	49	13	38	49	9	10	72	9	--	--
Virginia	91	--	20	80	--	61	31	8	--	--
Southeast	57	31	17	52	17	16	28	34	1	4
Arkansas	87	91	7	2	37	18	23	16	6	--
Louisiana	97	80	10	10	45	10	21	3	7	14
Mississippi	67	63	31	6	31	7	28	32	1	1
Missouri	89	100	--	--	19	--	--	38	33	10
Tennessee	42	73	22	5	24	--	--	65	--	12
South Central 3/	73	77	18	5	33	10	21	26	6	4
Oklahoma	83	35	--	65	17	26	22	26	--	9
Texas	66	66	1	33	26	13	27	15	2	17
Southwest	68	61	1	38	25	15	26	16	2	16
Arizona	36	44	--	56	12	50	--	--	--	38
California	12	--	--	100	--	--	100	--	--	--
New Mexico	33	50	--	50	17	17	50	16	--	--
West 2/	25	32	--	68	35	30	15	5	--	15
United States	62	58	12	30	26	14	24	25	3	8

1/ For more detailed data by State districts, see appendix table 7.
2/ Includes, in order of rank, too much trouble, quality too low, fire hazard, and lack of labor.
3/ Totals include minor States not shown.

fertilizer and soil conditioner. Lack of baling and collecting equipment, lack of market, and low prices were the most frequent reasons given for discarding motes.

SUPPLY OF GIN MOTES

The quantity of motes collected from each bale of cotton ginned depends largely upon such factors as (a) method of harvest; (b) number of lint cleaner stages used in the ginning process, and whether motes are collected from all stages of lint cleaning; (c) amount of overhead cleaning seed cotton receives; and (d) degree of cleaning that motes receive at the gin.

The supply of gin motes was estimated by applying the percentage of sample bales from which motes were collected by districts to total ginnings as reported by the Bureau of the Census, and multiplying by the average pounds of motes collected per bale from sample gins. 3/ These district totals were then combined into State and national estimates.

Even though some State districts have a substantial number of gins collecting motes, total ginnings of the district may be relatively low. Also, some States have a high proportion of gins collecting motes, but some districts within the State may have few or no gins collecting. Thus, to be most useful to dealers and consumers, supply data were developed for each district.

Southeast

Sample gins in the Southeastern region collected over 2.8 million pounds of gin motes, and the estimated supply for the region was approximately 13 million pounds (table 3). Alabama was the leading State in gin mote supply in the Southeast. About 71 percent of this State's estimated 6.4 million pounds originated from its hill section gins (appendix table 8). Georgia and South Carolina were second and third in supply, with 3.1 and 2.8 million pounds, respectively. Most of the motes from these two States came from the Coastal Plains districts.

Motes were collected from about 46 percent of the cotton ginned by sample gins in the Southeast. North Carolina had the largest proportion--almost 54 percent--and Florida the smallest, less than 9 percent.

Average quantity of motes collected per bale in the Southeast was 23 pounds, about 5 pounds more than the average for other regions. This probably reflects the small proportion of motes cleaned in the Southeast. While 90 percent of the gins collecting motes in the Southeast had mote presses for baling, only 7 percent of the total volume of baled motes was cleaned, because cleaning results in weight loss.

3/ The terms "sample gins," "sample bales," and "sample data" refer to the 692 gins contacted in the study and the data obtained from these gins.

Table 3.--Supply of cotton gin motes, by State and region, 1966-67

State and region 1/	U.S. mote supply 2/	Sample data used in making supply estimates: Number of bales ginned	Bales motes were collected from: Proportion	Bales motes were collected from: Total	Motes collected per bale	Total motes collected
	1,000 lbs.	1,000 bales	Percent	1,000 bales	Pounds	1,000 lbs.
Alabama	6,396	95.8	48.5	46.5	28.0	1,302
Florida	27	8.2	8.5	.7	36.5	27
Georgia	3,084	66.6	38.9	25.9	3/ 25.1	635
North Carolina	837	35.8	53.9	19.3	15.6	301
South Carolina	2,798	62.6	49.0	30.7	19.2	591
Virginia	8	2.2	36.4	.8	10.1	8
Southeast	13,150	271.2	45.7	123.9	3/ 23.2	2,864
Arkansas	869	98.0	7.4	7.3	15.0	110
Louisiana	368	87.2	6.1	5.3	12.3	65
Mississippi	9,020	271.4	31.8	86.3	3/ 19.4	1,561
Missouri	355	26.0	6.9	1.8	30.6	54
Tennessee	3,529	50.6	53.6	27.1	3/ 17.9	459
South Central 4/	14,141	534.7	23.9	127.8	3/ 18.6	2,249
Oklahoma	515	41.1	26.8	11.0	3/ 9.2	67
Texas	24,359	505.0	41.0	207.1	18.8	3,644
Southwest	24,874	546.1	39.9	218.1	3/ 18.5	3,711
Arizona	4,336	75.6	68.2	51.6	3/ 12.4	565
California	23,350	156.5	86.3	135.0	3/ 21.8	2,513
New Mexico	1,785	36.9	74.0	27.3	14.4	394
West 4/	29,471	272.5	78.5	213.9	3/ 18.5	3,472
United States 4/	81,636	1,624.5	42.1	683.7	3/ 19.4	12.296

1/ For more detailed data by State districts, see appendix table 8.

2/ Based on sample gin data from proportion of bales from which motes were collected, and average pounds collected per bale. Data from sample gins were expanded by applying total ginnings reported by the U.S. Census.

3/ Some bale collection figures were given which pounds of motes collected were not available. These pounds collected divided by bales from which motes were collected will not yield average pounds shown.

4/ Totals include minor States not shown.

South Central

The supply of gin motes in the South Central region was estimated at 14 million pounds in 1966-67 (table 3). Mississippi was the largest single supplier, accounting for almost two-thirds of the regional total. Sample gins in this State collected over 1.5 million pounds, and the estimated State supply exceeded 9 million pounds. Tennessee had the second largest supply with 3.5 million pounds.

Motes were collected from less than 24 percent of the bales ginned in this region. Approximately 19 pounds of motes were collected from each bale.

Southwest

Sample gins in the Southwestern region collected motes from about 40 percent of the bales ginned (table 3). Over 3.7 million pounds were collected at these gins, and almost 25 million pounds at all gins in the region. The western district of Texas accounted for 16.2 million pounds, or nearly two-thirds of the regional supply (appendix table 8).

West

The Western region accounted for over one-third of the estimated supply of motes from U. S. cotton gins in 1966-67. Over three-fourths of the estimated 29.5 million pounds of motes from this region came from California. California and Texas accounted for half of the estimated 81.6 million pounds of motes collected at U. S. gins in 1966-67.

PRICES RECEIVED

Ginners received an average of 3.25 cents per pound for baled gin motes in 1966-67 (table 4). Regional prices varied from an average of 2.79 cents per pound in the Southeast to 4.22 cents per pound in the West. Variation in prices seemed to reflect the proportion of baled motes cleaned, which was 7 percent in the Southeast and 80 percent in the West. The higher price for motes in the Western region may also be due to better fiber length and strength. Average prices of baled motes in the South Central and Southwest were 3.21 and 3.59 cents per pound, respectively. Again, price probably reflects cleaning practices; 18 percent of the baled motes in the South Central region were cleaned at the gin, compared with 58 percent in the Southwest. Motes from the Southwestern region are also noted for their good resilience, which makes them especially well suited in manufacturing cotton batting.

The average U. S. price for motes in loose form was 0.86 cent per pound. The South Central region had the highest average price with 1.58 cents per pound, and the Southwest had the lowest average price with 0.43 cent per pound. Differences in average price for loose motes are probably due to market conditions prevailing in a particular area, or to the manner in which motes are handled. Some ginners construct their own collecting facility, and also

Table 4.--Average prices received per pound for cotton gin motes, by form in which bought and type of outlet, by State and regions, 1966-67

State and region 1/	Average price received		Av. price paid by type of outlet and by form in which motes were bought							
			Mote plant		Linters dealer		Mote dealer		Other 2/	
	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose
	Cents									
Alabama	3.19	--	2.16	--	3.87	--	3.13	--	3.32	--
Florida	3.00	--	3.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Georgia	2.16	0.43	3.00	--	1.75	--	2.21	0.43	--	--
North Carolina	2.98	1.51	3.50	--	3.00	--	2.97	1.51	--	--
South Carolina	2.29	0.99	--	--	3.50	--	2.25	0.49	2.18	1.29
Virginia	--	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	1.00	--	--
Southeast	2.79	0.96	2.44	--	2.91	--	2.61	0.70	3.16	1.29
Arkansas	3/5.00	1.80	--	--	--	--	5.00	2.00	--	1.62
Louisiana	3.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.00	--
Mississippi	3.12	1.34	2.00	1.27	3.70	--	3.44	1.70	2.50	--
Missouri	--	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	1.00	--	--
Tennessee	3.33	2.33	3.50	3.10	--	--	3.52	1.44	3.50	--
South Central 4/	3.21	1.58	2.20	1.57	3.70	--	3.64	1.51	2.80	1.62
Oklahoma	1.50	0.25	--	--	--	--	1.50	0.25	--	--
Texas	3.66	0.43	4.20	0.45	3.93	--	2.78	0.41	--	--
Southwest	3.59	0.43	4.20	0.45	3.93	--	2.68	0.41	--	--
Arizona	3/6.00	1.02	--	1.04	--	--	--	1.00	6.00	--
California	3.30	1.01	3.30	1.01	--	--	--	1.28	--	--
New Mexico	4.26	0.57	--	0.58	--	--	4.26	0.43	--	--
West 4/	4.22	0.97	3.30	1.00	--	--	4.26	1.10	6.00	--
United States	3.25	0.86	3.48	0.90	3.60	--	2.87	0.83	3.09	1.49

1/ For more detailed data by State districts, see appendix table 9.

2/ Usually consists of direct sales to mill waste dealers, batting or bedding manufacturers, and similar outlets.

3/ Based on less than 3 sales.

4/ Totals include minor States not shown.

haul loose motes to cleaning plants, using their own equipment and labor. In other cases, the buyer furnishes the collecting facility and picks up the loose motes at the gin, using his own equipment and labor. Thus, the difference between prices received for loose motes under the two arrangements is similar to the difference between delivered and f.o.b. prices.

Price Differentials

The difference in average U.S. prices for baled and loose motes was 2.39 cents per pound. Price spreads for baled and loose motes varied from 1.63 cents per pound in the South Central region to 3.25 cents per pound in the Western region.

Cost data developed in 1963 showed that average cost per pound for collecting and packaging a 500-pound bale of motes was approximately 1.14 cents in the Southwestern region and 1.64 cents in the South Central region. 4/ In the San Joaquin Valley, where collecting in loose form is a common practice, the cost of collecting 500 pounds of loose motes averaged 32 cents, less than 0.01 cent per pound. Selling motes in baled form is probably not justifiable for most gins in the Southeast and South Central regions when motes can be sold loose. In contrast, price spreads in the Southwest and West favor selling motes in baled form.

Cleaning Versus Not Cleaning

Ginners have sometimes complained that price differentials for cleaned and uncleaned baled motes are not wide enough to offset weight loss due to cleaning. Based on data for a combined total of 58 lots, representing 1,904,775 pounds of cleaned motes and 1,908,131 pounds of uncleaned motes sold in 1966-67, price differences for cleaned and uncleaned motes were highly significant statistically, but they were not great enough to offset weight loss in most cases.

Using the 1966-67 average price of 3.13 cents per pound for uncleaned motes and 4.06 cents per pound for cleaned motes, weight losses greater than 22 percent result in lower returns than if motes are sold uncleaned. Assuming a net bale weight of 500 pounds before cleaning and 400 pounds after cleaning (a 20-percent weight loss), bale value is only 59 cents greater than that of uncleaned motes (table 5). A 30-percent loss results in a $1.44 decrease in bale value.

Even though cleaning motes at the gin does not seem to be a profitable practice under current price structure, some ginners must clean their motes to have a marketable product. This is especially true in areas where cotton is commonly harvested by machine stripping. If motes must be cleaned, and the premium for cleaning is less than 1 cent, the degree of cleaning should be limited to keep weight losses from exceeding 20 percent of original weight.

4/ Holder, Shelby H., Jr., and Looney, Zolon M. Reclaiming and Marketing Cotton Gin Motes. U.S. Dept. Agr. Econ. Res. Serv. ERS-168 14 pp., Illus. May 1964.

Table 5.--Estimated price of baled cotton gin motes before and after cleaning, using 1966-67 average price and specified weight losses due to cleaning

Weight loss (Percent)	Net bale weight 1/		Price				Difference
			Before cleaning		After cleaning		
	Before cleaning	After cleaning	Per pound 2/	Per bale	Per pound 3/	Per bale	
	Pounds	Pounds	Cents	Dollars	Cents	Dollars	Dollars
10	500	450	3.13	15.65	4.06	18.27	+ 2.62
20	500	400	3.13	15.65	4.06	16.24	+ .59
30	500	350	3.13	15.65	4.06	14.21	- 1.44
40	500	300	3.13	15.65	4.06	12.18	- 3.47
50	500	250	3.13	15.65	4.06	10.15	- 5.50
60	500	200	3.13	15.65	4.06	8.12	- 7.53

1/ After deducting bagging and ties.
2/ Average price based on 23 lots totaling 1,908,131 pounds, 1966-67.
3/ Average price based on 35 lots totaling 1,904,775 pounds, 1966-67.

Prices Received by Outlets

An analysis of prices received for gin motes by type of outlet showed that linters dealers and mote plants generally paid higher prices for gin motes than other outlets (table 4). Quality of motes normally purchased by a particular dealer, or other special considerations, probably explain the slight price variations between outlets. Linters dealers frequently buy motes to fill special orders, so may normally buy better quality motes, or be willing to pay slightly higher prices to obtain the lots desired. A mote plant operator having cleaning facilities might bid higher than a mote dealer not having such facilities since the mote dealer must allow for the cost of having trashy motes cleaned. With all factors considered, it seems that the various outlets for motes are reasonably competitive.

Table 6.--Proportion of gins that collected motes, collecting method, and sales outlet, by district, State, and region, 1966-67

District State, and region 1/	Gins collecting	Collecting method		Baled motes cleaned	Outlet			
		Baled	Loose		Mote plant	Linters dealer	Mote dealer	Other
	Percent							
Alabama:								
Coastal plain...	45	100	--	10	24	--	54	22
Piedmont.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill section....	48	100	--	33	17	25	16	42
State.....	46	100	--	23	20	13	34	33
Florida:								
State.....	20	100	--	--	100	--	--	--
Georgia:								
Coastal plain...	47	90	10	--	15	8	77	--
Piedmont.....	20	100	--	--	--	--	100	--
Hill section....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	36	90	10	--	13	7	80	--
North Carolina:								
Coastal plain...	45	78	22	--	8	--	92	--
Piedmont.....	61	90	10	--	--	9	82	9
State.....	51	83	17	--	4	4	88	4
South Carolina:								
Coastal plain...	52	75	25	--	--	8	54	38
Piedmont.....	50	60	40	--	--	11	78	11
State.....	51	72	28	--	--	9	64	27
Virginia:								
Coastal plain...	17	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
Piedmont.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	9	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
Southeast.....	43	90	10	7	10	8	65	17

See footnotes at end of table, page 13.

Continued--

Table 6.--Proportion of gins collecting motes, collecting method and sales outlets. by district, State and region,1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Gins collecting	Collecting method		Baled motes cleaned	Outlet			
		Baled	Loose		Mote Plant	Linters dealer	Mote dealer	Other
	-Percent-							
Arkansas:								
Hill section....	18	100	--	50	--	--	100	--
Delta.....	8	--	100	--	--	--	--	100
State.....	13	57	43	50	--	--	71	29
Louisiana:								
Coastal plain...	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill section....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delta.....	5	100	--	100	--	--	--	100
Gulf Coast Prairie.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	3	100	--	100	--	--	--	100
Mississippi:								
Coastal plain...	25	100	--	8	9	75	8	8
Delta.....	42	62	38	33	44	33	22	--
Hill section....	38	83	17	15	50	17	33	--
State..	33	78	22	17	30	48	18	4
Missouri:								
Hill section....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delta.....	13	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
State.....	11	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
Tennessee:								
Delta.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill section....	62	72	28	22	23	--	71	6
State.....	58	71	28	22	23	--	71	6
South Central 2/..	27	75	25	18	22	24	44	9

See footnotes at end of table, page 13.

Continued--

Table 6.--Proportion of gins collecting motes, collecting method and sales outlets by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Gins collecting	Collecting method		Baled motes cleaned	Outlet			
		Baled	Loose		Mote Plant	Linters dealer	Mote dealer	Other
	Percent							
Oklahoma:								
Western	18	96	4	50	--	--	100	--
Hill section	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State	17	96	4	50	--	--	100	--
Texas:								
Western	41	53	47	77	56	3	41	--
Gulf Coast Prairie 2/	22	57	43	60	40	10	50	--
Hill section	31	7	93	--	33	--	67	--
Irrigation	35	62	38	--	17	--	83	--
State	34	52	48	59	47	4	49	--
Southwest	32	52	48	58	44	4	53	--
Arizona:								
State	64	30	70	50	42	--	50	8
California:								
State	88	13	87	100	52	--	48	--
New Mexico:								
Western	67	--	100	--	--	--	100	--
Irrigation	67	42	58	100	33	--	67	--
State	67	35	65	100	25	--	75	--
West 3/	75	18	82	80	45	--	53	2
United States	38	54	46	23	27	9	56	8

1/ Farm management districts. See appendix table 10 for list of major cotton producing counties included in each district.

2/ Includes the Black waxy soil management district.

3/ Totals include minor States not shown.

Table 7.--Proportion of Southeastern gins that discarded motes, method of disposal, and reason for discarding, by district, State, and region, 1966-67

District, State, and region 1/	Gins discarding	Method of disposal			Reason for discarding					
		Burned	Left on premises	Other	Lack of equipment	Volume too small	Lack of market	Price too low	Customer relation	Other
	Percent									
Alabama:										
Coastal plain..	55	41	24	35	35	--	5	55	5	--
Piedmont.....	100	--	--	100	--	100	--	--	--	--
Hill section...	52	64	7	29	33	--	33	20	--	14
State.....	54	50	16	34	33	3	17	39	3	6
Florida:										
State.....	80	50	--	50	50	--	25	25	--	--
Georgia:										
Coastal plain..	53	67	5	28	30	4	11	44	--	11
Piedmont.....	80	--	27	73	18	--	54	18	--	9
Hill section...	100	--	40	60	17	--	--	83	--	--
State.....	64	42	15	43	25	2	21	43	--	9
North Carolina:										
Coastal plain..	55	25	6	69	--	32	8	60	--	--
Piedmont.....	39	--	--	100	--	75	--	25	--	--
State.....	49	17	4	79	--	41	6	53	--	--
South Carolina:										
Coastal plain..	48	14	30	56	13	--	81	6	--	--
Piedmont.....	50	10	50	40	7	20	67	7	--	--
State.....	49	13	38	49	9	10	72	9	--	--
Virginia:										
Coastal plain..	83	--	--	100	--	60	20	20	--	--
Piedmont.....	100	--	40	60	--	62	38	--	--	--
State.....	91	--	20	80	--	61	31	8	--	--
Southeast.....	57	31	17	52	17	16	28	34	1	4

See footnotes at end of table, page 16.

Continued--

Table 7.--Proportion of South Central gins that discarded motes, method of disposal and reason for discarding, by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Gins discarding	Method of disposal			Reason for discarding					
		Burned	Left on premises	Other	Lack of equipment	Volume too small	Lack of market	Price too low	Customer relation	Other
	Percent									
Arkansas:										
Hill section...	82	88	8	4	36	26	16	16	6	--
Delta.....	92	95	5	--	39	10	29	16	6	--
State.....	87	91	7	2	37	18	23	16	6	--
Louisiana:										
Coastal plain..	100	--	100	--	--	50	--	50	--	--
Hill section...	100	50	25	25	33	33	33	--	--	--
Delta.....	95	90	--	10	52	--	19	--	10	19
Gulf Coast Prairie.....	100	100	--	--	33	33	34	--	--	--
State.....	97	80	10	10	45	10	21	3	7	14
Mississippi:										
Coastal plain..	75	39	58	3	21	8	3	66	3	--
Delta.....	58	100	--	--	53	9	31	3	--	3
Hill section...	62	60	13	27	13	--	81	6	--	--
State.....	67	63	31	6	31	7	28	32	1	1
Missouri:										
Hill section...	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	50	50	--
Delta.....	87	100	--	--	24	--	--	35	29	12
State.....	89	100	--	--	19	--	--	38	33	10
Tennessee:										
Delta.....	100	100	--	--	33	--	--	34	--	33
Hill section...	38	70	23	7	20	--	--	67	--	13
State.....	42	74	20	6	24	--	--	65	--	12
South Central 2/	73	77	18	5	33	10	21	26	6	4

See footnote at end of table, page 16.

Continued--

Table 7.--Proportion of gins discarding motes, method of disposal and reason for discarding, by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Gins discarding	Method of disposal			Reason for discarding					
		Burned	Left on premises	Other	Lack of equipment	Volume too small	Lack of market	Price too low	Customer relation	Other
	Percent									
Oklahoma:										
Western	82	39	--	61	15	25	20	30	--	10
Hill section	100	--	--	100	33	33	33	--	--	--
State	83	35	--	65	17	26	22	26	--	9
Texas:										
Western	59	82	--	18	33	3	28	25	--	10
Gulf Coast Prairie 2/	78	52	2	46	32	24	2	8	6	28
Hill section	69	25	--	75	25	31	13	--	--	31
Irrigation	65	100	--	--	--	13	25	50	--	12
State	66	66	1	33	26	13	27	15	2	17
Southwest	68	61	1	38	25	15	26	16	2	16
Arizona:										
State	36	44	--	56	12	50	--	--	--	38
California:										
State	12	--	--	100	--	--	100	--	--	--
New Mexico:										
Western	33	100	--	--	50	--	--	50	--	--
Irrigation	33	--	--	100	--	25	75	--	--	--
State	33	50	--	50	17	17	50	16	--	--
West 3/	25	32	--	68	35	30	15	5	--	15
United States 3/	62	58	12	30	26	14	24	25	3	8

1/ Farm management districts. See appendix table 10 for list of major cotton producing counties included in each district.

2/ Includes the Black waxy soil management district.

3/ Totals include minor States not shown.

Table 8.--Supply of cotton gin motes, by district, State, and region, 1966-67

District, State, and region 1/	Mote supply: All gins 2/	Mote supply: Sample gins	Data from sample gins: Bales ginned	Data from sample gins: Bales motes collected from: Total	Data from sample gins: Bales motes collected from: Proportion	Data from sample gins: Motes collected per bale
	Pounds	Pounds	Number	Number	Percent	Pounds
Alabama:						
Coastal plain	1,850,942	512,620	43,710	18,505	42.3	27.7
Piedmont	--	--	650	--	--	--
Hill section	4,544,922	789,149	51,480	28,041	54.5	28.1
State	6,395,864	1,301,769	95,840	46,546	48.6	28.0
Florida:						
State	27,594	26,650	8,226	730	8.9	36.5
Georgia:						
Coastal plain	2,829,398	596,055	51,042	22,967	45.0	26.0
Piedmont	254,462	39,250	10,431	2,917	28.0	3/ 16.4
Hill section	--	--	5,150	--	--	--
State	3,083,860	635,305	66,623	25,884	38.8	3/ 25.1
North Carolina:						
Coastal plain	560,664	181,900	23,592	10,117	42.9	18.0
Piedmont	276,445	118,980	12,156	9,156	75.3	13.0
State	837,109	300,880	35,748	19,273	53.9	15.6
South Carolina:						
Coastal plain	2,305,813	447,100	43,112	22,489	52.2	19.9
Piedmont	492,114	144,170	19,460	8,212	42.2	17.6
State	2,797,927	591,270	62,572	30,701	49.1	19.2
Virginia:						
Coastal plain	7,656	8,000	1,962	794	40.5	10.1
Piedmont	--	--	222	--	--	--
State	7,565	8,000	2,184	794	36.4	10.1
Southeast	13,150,010	2,863,874	271,193	123,928	45.7	3/ 23.2

See footnotes at end of table, page 19.

Continued--

Table 8.--Supply of cotton gin motes, by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Mote supply		Data from sample gins			
	All gins 2/	Sample gins	Bales ginned	Bales motes collected from: Total	Proportion	Motes collected per bale
	Pounds	Pounds	Number	Number	Percent	Pounds
Arkansas:						
Hill section	607,894	75,750	45,794	4,873	10.6	15.5
Delta	260,917	34,340	52,243	2,481	4.8	13.8
State	868,811	110,090	98,037	7,354	7.5	15.0
Louisiana:						
Coastal plain	--	--	1,137	--	--	--
Hill section	--	--	9,678	--	--	--
Delta	368,422	65,000	72,469	5,300	7.3	12.3
Gulf Coast Prairie	--	--	3,888	--	--	--
State	368,422	65,000	87,172	5,300	6.1	12.3
Mississippi:						
Coastal plain	1,379,770	505,430	106,138	26,942	25.4	18.8
Delta	6,105,590	776,612	112,460	42,286	37.6	4/ 20.3
Hill section	1,535,061	279,400	52,820	17,056	32.3	4/ 18.1
State	9,020,421	1,561,442	271,418	86,284	31.8	4/ 19.4
Missouri:						
Hill section	--	--	3,154	--	--	--
Delta	354,776	53,960	22,850	1,762	7.7	30.6
State	354,776	53,960	26,004	1,762	6.8	30.6
Tennessee:						
Delta	--	--	2,275	--	--	--
Hill section	3,528,806	458,794	48,312	27,109	56.1	4/ 17.9
State	3,528,806	458,794	50,587	27,109	53.6	4/ 17.9
South Central 3/	14,141,236	2,249,286	534,695	127,809	23.9	4/ 18.6

See footnote at end of table, page 19.

Continued--

Table 8.--Supply of cotton gin motes, by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Mote supply		Data from sample gins			
	All gins 2/	Sample gins	Bales ginned	Bales motes collected from: Total	Proportion	Motes collected per bale
	Pounds	Pounds	Number	Number	Percent	Pounds
Oklahoma:						
Western	514,887	66,900	37,561	11,035	29.4	3/ 9.2
Hill section	--	--	3,519	--	--	--
State	514,887	66,900	41,080	11,035	26.9	9.2
Texas:						
Western	16,209,137	2,613,047	321,470	143,839	44.7	3/ 18.6
Gulf Coast Prairie 2/	4,794,043	441,292	99,297	24,365	24.5	3/ 26.3
Hill section	1,190,036	229,320	25,635	11,566	45.1	3/ 25.3
Irrigation	2,165,486	360,040	58,622	27,314	46.6	13.2
State	24,358,702	3,643,699	505,024	207,084	41.0	3/ 18.8
Southwest	24,873,589	3,710,599	546,104	218,119	39.9	3/ 18.5
Arizona:						
State	4,336,268	565,602	75,591	51,643	68.3	3/ 12.4
California						
State	23,350,111	2,512,748	156,481	134,972	86.2	3/ 21.8
New Mexico:						
Western	241,692	62,747	7,059	3,798	53.8	16.5
Irrigation	1,543,019	331,380	29,855	23,488	78.7	14.1
State	1,784,711	394,127	36,914	27,286	73.9	14.4
West 4/	29,471,090	3,472,477	272,520	213,901	78.5	3/ 18.5
United States 4/	81,635,925	12,296,236	1,624,512	683,757	42.1	3/ 19.4

1/ Farm management district. See appendix table 10 for lost of major cotton producing counties included in each district.

2/ Based on sample gin data from proportion of bales from which motes were collected, and average pounds collected per bale. Data from sample gins were applied to total ginnings reported in the U.S. Census in March 1967.

3/ Some bale collection figures were given for which pounds of motes collected were not available. Thus, pounds collected, divided by bales from which motes were collected, will not yield average pounds shown.

4/ Totals include minor States not shown.

Table 9.--Average prices received per pound for cotton gin motes, by district, State, and region, 1966-67

District State, and region 1/	Average price received		Av. price paid by type of outlet and by form in which motes were purchased							
			Mote plant		Linters dealer		Mote dealer		Other	
	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose
	Cents									
Alabama:										
Coastal plain..	2.83	--	2.25	--	--	--	2.89	--	2.95	--
Piedmont.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill section...	3.48	--	2.00	--	3.87	--	3.72	--	3.46	--
State.....	3.19	--	2.16	--	3.87	--	3.13	--	3.32	--
Florida:										
State.....	3.00	--	3.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Georgia:										
Coastal plain..	1.98	0.43	3.00	--	1.75	--	1.99	0.43	--	--
Piedmont.....	4.50	--	--	--	--	--	4.50	--	--	--
Hill section...	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	2.16	0.43	3.00	--	1.75	--	2.21	0.43	--	--
North Carolina:										
Coastal plain..	2.79	1.51	3.50	--	--	--	2.77	1.51	--	--
Piedmont.....	3.23	1.50	--	--	3.00	--	3.24	1.50	--	--
State.....	2.98	1.51	3.50	--	3.00	--	2.97	1.51	--	--
South Carolina:										
Coastal plain..	2.19	0.99	--	--	--	--	2.19	0.34	2.18	1.25
Piedmont.....	2.70	0.99	--	--	3.50	--	2.45	0.91	--	1.50
State.....	2.29	0.99	--	--	3.50	--	2.25	0.49	2.18	1.29
Virginia:										
Coastal plain..	--	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	1.00	--	--
Piedmont.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	--	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	1.00	--	--
Southeast.....	2.79	0.96	2.44	--	2.91	--	2.61	0.70	3.16	1.29

See footnote at end of table, page 22.

Continued--

Table 9.--Average prices received per pound for cotton gin motes, by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District, State, and region 1/	Average price received		Av. price paid by type of outlet and by form in which motes were purchsed							
			Mote plant		Linters dealer		Mote dealer		Other	
	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose
	Cents									
Arkansas:										
Hill section...	5.00	2.00	--	--	--	--	5.00	2.00	--	--
Delta.....	--	1.62	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.62
State.....	5.00	1.80	--	--	--	--	5.00	2.00	--	1.62
Louisiana:										
Coastal plain..	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill section...	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delta.....	3.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.00	--
Gulf Coast Prairie.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	3.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.00	--
Mississippi:										
Coastal plain..	3.59	--	3.00	--	3.97	--	2.00	--	2.50	--
Delta.....	2.99	1.17	--	1.27	3.44	--	4.50	1.48	--	--
Hill section...	2.34	2.39	1.96	--	2.38	--	2.00	2.00	--	--
State.....	3.12	1.34	2.00	1.27	3.70	--	3.44	1.70	2.50	--
Missouri:										
Hill section...	--	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	1.00	--	--
Delta.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State.....	--	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	1.00	--	--
Tennessee:										
Delta.....	3.33	2.33	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill section...	--	--	3.50	3.10	--	--	3.52	1.44	3.50	--
State.....	3.33	2.33	3.50	3.10	--	--	3.52	1.44	3.50	--
South Central....	3.21	1.58	2.20	1.57	3.70	--	3.64	1.51	2.80	1.62

See footnote at end of table, page 22.

Continued--

Table 9.--Average prices received per pound for cotton gin motes, by district, State, and region, 1966-67--Continued

District State and region 1/	Average price received		Av. price paid by type of outlet and by form in which motes were purchased							
			Mote plant		Linters dealer		Mote dealer		Other	
	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose	Baled	Loose
	-Cents-									
Oklahoma:										
Western	1.50	0.25	--	--	--	--	1.50	0.25	--	--
Hill section	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
State	1.50	0.25	--	--	--	--	1.50	0.25	--	--
Texas:										
Western	3.78	0.39	4.26	0.42	4.00	--	2.93	0.36	--	--
Gulf Coast Prairie 2/	3.36	0.50	1.50	0.50	2.00	--	3.52	1.00	--	--
Hill section	3/ 1.75	0.50	--	--	--	--	1.75	0.50	--	--
Irrigation	3.41	0.58	--	--	--	--	1.09	0.50	--	--
State	3.66	0.43	4.20	0.45	3.93	--	2.78	0.41	--	--
Southwest	3.59	0.43	4.20	0.45	3.93	--	2.68	0.41	--	--
Arizona:										
State	3/ 6.00	1.02	--	1.04	--	--	--	1.00	3/ 6.00	--
California:										
State	3.30	1.01	3.30	1.01	--	--	--	1.28	--	--
New Mexico:										
Western	--	0.50	--	--	--	--	--	0.50	--	--
Irrigation	4.26	0.50	--	0.85	--	--	4.26	0.38	--	--
State	4.26	0.57	--	0.85	--	--	4.26	0.43	--	--
West 4/	4.22	0.97	3.30	1.00	--	--	4.26	1.10	3/ 6.00	--
United States 4/	3.25	0.86	3.48	0.90	3.60	--	2.87	0.83	3.09	1.49

1/ Farm management districts. See appendix table 10 for list of major cotton producing counties included in each district.
2/ Includes Black Waxy soil management district.
3/ Based on one sale.
4/ Totals include minor States not shown.

Table 10.--Major cotton producing counties in specified soil management districts, by State, 1966-67

ALABAMA

Coastal plain:
- Barbour
- Butler
- Conecuh
- Covington
- Crenshaw
- Dallas
- Escambia
- Geneva
- Hale
- Henry
- Houston
- Lowndes
- Macon
- Marengo
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Perry
- Pike
- Russell
- Sumter
- Wilcox

Piedmont:
- Randolph

Hill section:
- Autauga
- Blount
- Calhoun
- Cherokee
- Colbert
- Cullman
- De Kalb
- Elmore
- Etowah
- Fayette
- Franklin
- Jackson
- Lamar
- Lauderdale
- Lawrence
- Limestone
- Madison
- Marion
- Marshall
- Morgan
- Pickens
- Shelby
- Tuscaloosa

ARKANSAS

Hill section:
- Ashley
- Clay
- Craighead
- Cross
- Drew
- Faulkner
- Greene
- Hempstead
- Jackson
- Lafayette
- Lawrence
- Lee
- Lonoke
- Poinsett
- Pulaski
- Randolph
- St. Francis
- White
- Woodruff
- Yell

Delta:
- Arkansas
- Chicot
- Crittenden
- Desha
- Jefferson
- Lincoln
- Miller
- Mississippi
- Monroe
- Phillips

GEORGIA

Coastal plain:
- Bleckley
- Brooks
- Bulloch
- Burke
- Calhoun
- Candler
- Colquitt
- Crisp
- Dodge
- Dooly
- Emanuel
- Jefferson
- Johnson
- Laurens
- Macon
- Mitchell
- Pulaski
- Screven
- Sumter
- Terrell
- Thomas
- Tift
- Toombs
- Turner
- Washington
- Wilcox
- Worth

Piedmont:
- Coweta
- Hart
- Madison
- Meriwether
- Morgan
- Oconee
- Pike
- Taylor
- Walton

Hill section:
- Bartow
- Floyd
- Gordon

LOUISIANA

Coastal plain:
- None

Hill section:
- Caldwell

Delta:
- Avoyelles
- Bossier
- Caddo
- Catahoula
- Concordia
- East Carroll
- Franklin
- Madison
- Morehouse
- Natchitoches
- Ouachita
- Rapides
- Red River
- Richland
- St. Landry
- Tensas
- West Carroll

Gulf Coast Prairie:
- Acadia
- Evangeline
- LaFayette

MISSISSIPPI

Coastal plain:
- Amite
- Attala
- Carroll
- Clay
- Copiah
- Hinds
- Holmes
- Jefferson Davis
- Kemper
- Lauderdale
- Lawrence
- Leake
- Lowndes
- Madison
- Marion
- Montgomery
- Noxubee
- Scott
- Walthall
- Webster
- Winston
- Yazoo

Delta:
- Bolivar
- Coahoma
- Humphries
- Issaquena
- Leflore
- Quitman
- Sharkey
- Sunflower
- Tallahatchie
- Tunica
- Washington

Hill section:
- Alcorn
- Benton
- Calhoun
- Chickasaw
- De Soto
- Grenada
- Itawamba
- Lafayette
- Lee
- Marshall
- Monroe
- Panola
- Pontotoc
- Prentiss
- Tate
- Tippah
- Tishomingo
- Union
- Yalobusha

Table 10.--Major cotton producing counties in specified soil management districts, by States, 1966-67--Continued

MISSOURI

Hill section:
- Butler
- Stoddard

Delta:
- Dunklin
- Mississippi
- New Madrid
- Pemiscott
- Scott

NEW MEXICO

Western:
- Lea
- Roosevelt

Irrigation:
- Chaves
- Dona Ana
- Eddy
- Luna

NORTH CAROLINA

Coastal plain:
- Cumberland
- Edgecombe
- Halifax
- Harnett
- Johnston
- Nash
- Northampton
- Pitt
- Robeson
- Sampson
- Scotland
- Wilson

Piedmont:
- Anson
- Cleveland
- Franklin
- Iredell
- Lincoln
- Mecklenburg
- Rowan
- Rutherford
- Union
- Warren

OKLAHOMA

Western:
- Beckham
- Blaine
- Caddo
- Canadian
- Comanche
- Custer
- Grady
- Greer
- Garvin
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Kiowa
- Logan
- Roger Mills
- Tillman
- Washita

Hill section:
- Bryan
- Muskogee

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coastal plain:
- Allendale
- Bamberg
- Barnwell
- Calhoun
- Clarendon
- Colleton
- Darlington
- Dillon
- Dorchester
- Florence
- Hampton
- Lee
- Marion
- Marlboro
- Orangeburg
- Sumter
- Williamsburg

Piedmont:
- Abbeville
- Aiken
- Anderson
- Cherokee
- Chester
- Chesterfield
- Edgefield
- Greenville
- Lancaster
- Laurens
- Lexington
- Newberry
- Oconee
- Pickens
- Richland
- Saluda
- Spartanburg
- York

TEXAS

Western:
- Bailey
- Baylor
- Briscoe
- Castro
- Childres
- Cochran
- Coleman
- Collingsworth
- Cottle
- Crosby
- Dallam
- Dawson
- Deaf Smith
- Dickens
- Donley
- Fisher
- Floyd
- Foard
- Gaines
- Garza
- Glasscock
- Hale
- Hall
- Hardeman
- Haskell
- Hays
- Hockley
- Howard
- Jones
- Knox
- Lamb
- Lubbock
- Lynn
- McCulloch
- Martin
- Midland
- Mitchell
- Motley
- Nolan
- Parmer
- Runnels
- Scurry
- Swisher
- Taylor
- Terry
- Tom Green
- Wheller
- Wilbarger
- Willacy
- Yoakum
- Zavala

Gulf Coast Prairie:
- Bee
- Bell
- Brazoria
- Caldwell
- Calhoun
- Collin
- Coryell
- Delta
- Denton
- Ellis
- Falls
- Fannin
- Fayette

TEXAS

Gulf Coast Prairie:
- Fort Bend
- Grayson
- Guadalupe
- Hill
- Hunt
- Jackson
- Jim Wells
- Johnson
- Karnes
- Kaufman
- Lamar
- Limestone
- McLennan
- Matagorda
- Milam
- Navarro
- Nueces
- Refugio
- Rockwall
- San Patricio
- Tarrant
- Travis
- Victoria
- Washington
- Wharton
- Williamson
- Wilson

Hill section:
- Austin
- Bastrop
- Bowie
- Brazos
- Burleson
- Colorado
- Grimes
- Hopkins
- Houston
- Lavacca
- Red River
- Robertson

Irrigation:
- Cameron
- El Paso
- Hidalgo
- Hudspeth
- Pecos
- Reeves

VIRGINIA

Coastal plain:
- Greensville

Piedmont:
- Mecklenburg

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1967 O - 282-705